

Colusa Subreach Planning Project Advisory Workgroup
Draft Meeting Summary
June 4, 2007 10:00 AM - 2:00 PM
Colusa Industrial Properties
Colusa, CA

**Summary prepared by Carolyn Penny, Facilitator, Common Ground: Center for
Cooperative Solutions with assistance from Ellen Gentry, Sacramento River
Conservation Area Forum**

***Note the Change: The next AW meeting is scheduled for September 10, 2007 from 10
a.m. to noon, Colusa Industrial Properties.***

Present:

AW: Annalena Bronson, Burt Bundy, Mike Fehling, John Garner, and Greg Golet
(alternate for Dawit Zeleke)

Alternate with Member Present:

Woody Elliott (alternate for Mike Fehling), Beverley Anderson-Abbs (alternate for Burt Bundy)

Staff: Ellen Gentry (SRCAF), Facilitator Carolyn Penny (Common Ground), Project Manager Gregg Werner (TNC)

Guests: Ashley Emery (FWA), Denise Reichenberg (State Parks and Recreation)

Meeting Objectives:

- To gain an update on subreach planning-related activities, including the Sacramento River Restoration Science conference and the SRCAF Good Neighbor Policy;
- To learn about and discuss the initial pest species/regulatory effects analysis results;
- To receive and discuss preliminary restoration plans.
- To learn about and discuss the initial hydraulic analysis report;
- To review environmental assessment plans; and
- To plan for a community information session about the subreach

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Approx. Start Time</u>	<u>Lead Person</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Outcome</u>
1.	10:00	Carolyn Penny, Facilitator	Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review, February Meeting Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introductions. Approve agenda. Approve February meeting summary.
2.	10:10	Gregg Werner, Burt Bundy, All AW Members	Brief Updates on Larger Context of Subreach Planning-Related Activities (Sacramento River Restoration Science conference; Good Neighbor	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Share a sense of the larger context for conservation-related activities.

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Approx. Start Time</u>	<u>Lead Person</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Outcome</u>
			Policy; SRCAF staffing changes; other)	
3.	10:25	Greg Golet	Initial Pest and Regulatory Effects Analysis Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review initial results and provide comments for preparation of the draft report.
4.	11:05	Public	Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Receive comment.
5.	11:20	Gregg Werner, All AW Members	Preliminary Restoration Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review preliminary restoration plans and provide comments to clarify plans.
6.	11:50		Lunch and Break	
7.	12:20	Gregg Werner	Initial Hydraulic Analysis Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review Existing Conditions Hydraulic Analysis and gain a sense of timeline for remaining analysis.
8.	1:00	Public	Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Receive comment.
9.	1:15	Gregg Werner	Environmental Assessment Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review preliminary plans and provide comments for preparation of the draft assessment.
10.	1:30	Gregg Werner, All AW Members	Subreach Newsletter and Community Information Session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review newsletter results and plan for community information session.
11.	1:45	Gregg Werner, All AW Members	Next Meeting Dates, Next Agenda, and Next Steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shape next agenda. Confirm summer meeting dates.
12.	2:00		Adjourn	

Review of February Meeting Summary

The February meeting summary was accepted as written. Mike Fehling introduced Denise Reichenberg, who will be filling his seat on the Colusa AW.

Brief Updates on Larger Context of Subreach Planning-Related Activities

The Sacramento River Science Conference was held April 9-10 at CSU Chico, covering the Colusa to Red Bluff stretch. The informal conference brought individuals together to share feedback on how restoration can be done cooperatively and reviewed the balance of land use and activities along the river. The Forum assisted in two full days of presentations for 114 attendees. The information covered education, wildlife, vegetation, and societal concerns, with presentations divided into eight sessions. There were two presentations regarding hydraulic analysis and vegetation and wildlife responses. Landowner sessions, transboundary issues, pest issues were also reviewed. The free conference complemented existing work and helped foster and develop a sense of community to share information and move forward. The format and low cost worked well. Abstracts are available on a CD or on the SRCAF website. Kevin Wolf & Associates are working to put the full presentation on the web. The conference is expected to be repeated every two years.

The SRCAF Board adopted the Good Neighbor Policy (GNP) in March, which will assist in providing landowner incentives for restoration and conservation efforts. A Safe Harbor Agreement, for both federal and state species is being put together and will be on the SRCAF agenda June 28. Also, the CA Landowner Incentive Program (LIP) provides cost share restoration monies to landowners to restore habitat, allowing incentive payment of \$400/acre/year to create riparian corridors between existing riparian areas. The LIP, with assistance from DFG and NRCS, helps fill needs discussed during the development of the GNP.

Burt Bundy introduced Beverley Anderson-Abbs as the new SRCAF Manager. SRCAF will be looking to hire a Resource Conservation Assistant to replace Beverley's previous position. A job announcement will be posted through CSUC Research Foundation with the goal of a hire in July or August.

Existing Channel Capacity Hydraulic Analysis Report (Taken Out of Agenda Order to Address Scheduling Conflicts)

Gregg's PowerPoint presentation included the first phase of the hydraulic analysis, analysis of existing channel capacity. Analysis methods for existing channel capacity included: direct comparison of existing thalweg data with an overlay plot, field inventory of large woody debris and subsequent modeling of effects, two-dimensional hydraulic modeling and the comparison of modeled flood flow elevations to the 1957 system design.

Burt asked to what degree thalweg indicates flood flow. The thalweg comparisons for 1937, 1957 and 1997 gave inconclusive results regarding flood flow capacity. The data points for the three years varied so much that direct comparison would not be technically valid. A running mean however could incorporate variations.

The thalweg data show where water meets sediment. When sediment is mobilized, the channel is deeper and wider. Annalena noted that sediment has not raised the channel floor overall as previously questioned.

The hydraulic model development included fine element mesh, material roughness, existing land use, flow splits, boundary conditions and model calibration. Results for the next phase of hydraulic analysis are expected at the end of the summer.

Public Comment

In regard to the Sacramento River Science Conference, Ashley Emery, FWA, suggested that it is important not to dismiss landowner concerns just because they are not scientific concerns.

Ashley also expressed landowner concerns regarding the passage of the Good Neighbor Policy and wordage containing “should, shall, and may”. She stated that many landowners feel their concerns are falling on deaf ears. Gregg noted that the GNP is a piece of the puzzle, not the full solution. Burt noted the GNP Subcommittee included landowner members and that landowner concerns were carefully considered and incorporated into the policy providing the inclusion of a Safe Harbor Agreement for incidental take of endangered species. Conflicts with existing laws necessitated the current wordage. Burt added the GNP continues to be a work in progress and input is always welcome.

Preliminary Restoration Plans

Gregg Werner gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Preliminary Restoration Plans. He indicated the plans can be found online as part of the baseline assessments at www.sacramentoriver.ca.gov. He noted that the next phase of hydraulic analysis will test the preliminary restoration plans. Once any adjustments are made, TNC anticipates conversation with adjoining landowners about matters specific to each property.

Initial Pest and Regulatory Effects Study Results

Greg Golet, TNC, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Colusa Subreach Planning Pest and Regulatory Effects Study. The second meeting of local experts took place May 11 to discuss the results.

Part 1, Regulatory Effects, characterized existing regulations and identified differences between farms adjacent to habitat versus those adjacent to other farms.

The following information was included: special status species, agricultural operations, environmental laws and regulations, pesticide use laws and regulations, water quality laws and regulations, species protection laws and regulations. Special-status terrestrial species known to occur in the Subreach included: VELB, bank swallow, western yellow-billed cuckoo, Swainson's hawk, and white-tailed kite. Greg reviewed regulatory effects solutions: possible delisting VELB, Programmatic Safe Harbor Agreement, buffer strips, self-mitigated restoration designs, habitat conservation plans, and benefits of the GNP.

Part 2, Pest Effects, summarized high priority crops (orchards), row (field) crop rotations, prioritization of pest species, solutions and an evaluation. The high priority vertebrate pests included CA ground squirrel, Botta's pocket gopher, CA vole, mule deer, and the black rat. In summary, many pest species identified as high or medium priority have little to no chance of increasing in population or damage; some species may actually decrease. Solutions include: evaluation of restoration design(s), prevention (self mitigating design, planting protocols, and buffer strips), and abatement (trapping and baiting).

Preparation and presentation of the Draft Report is expected to be submitted to TNC in August. A presentation to the Advisory Workgroup will occur at its next meeting. The Final Report and a Final Report Executive Summary is due to TNC for review by August 28 with the final version available by September 28.

Greg noted that they have already met with adjoining landowners and will meet with them again. TNC would also like to see examples of problems that have yet to be picked up (i.e., Don Anderson mentioned salmonella and disease impacts from animals).

Public Comment

There was no public comment at this time.

Environmental Assessment Plans

The additional project for restoration properties in the Subreach pools information and provides CEQA documentation. This approach provides an opportunity to put together information for the public. DFG will serve as the lead agency. An independent contractor will be hired to prepare the environmental assessment, using existing information from various studies in an organized format. The request for proposals is expected by July 1. The interview is planned for August with a contract in September and a draft for public review in January. A 45-day public review period is planned. The document's long-term viability depends on how fast things change in the roughly 5-year window. Subsequent documents can address changes as well.

Subreach Newsletter and Community Information Session

The newsletter outline was reviewed at the last CSP meeting. The newsletter went out in March, following the suggested format. It will be important for the Community meeting to occur when the hydraulic analysis is completely finished in the fall.

Next Meeting and Next Steps

The next CSP AW meeting will be September 10, 10:00 a.m. - 12 noon, at Colusa Industrial Properties. *(Please note date change.)*

Agenda topics:

Pest and Regulatory Effects Presentation and Comment

November Community Meeting

The next CSP meeting after August 2007, will be held September 10 from ten a.m. to noon. The next phase of the hydraulic analysis and the community meeting are expected to be the agenda topics.

It was also noted that a Hydraulic Analysis Subgroup meeting would probably be scheduled prior to the September 10 AW meeting.

The tentative date for a “know your river” community meeting is November 14 or 15. The preliminary thought is to coordinate with entities such as DWR and Ayres for presentations. The Indian Community Center meeting space may work well.